

NONSTANDARD DIGRAPHS

A.H. Zemanian

Abstract — Nonstandard graphs have been defined and examined in prior works. The present work does the same for nonstandard digraphs. Since digraphs have more structure than do graphs, the present discussion requires more complicated definitions and yields a variety of results peculiar to nonstandard digraphs. A nonstandard digraph can be obtained by means of an ultrapower construction based on a sequence of digraphs or more elegantly by using the transfer principle. We use either or both techniques in particular circumstances. As special cases, we have the enlargement of a single infinite digraph and also hyperfinite digraphs based on sequences of finite digraphs. Also examined are such ideas as incidences and adjacencies for nonstandard arcs and vertices, connectedness, components, and galaxies in nonstandard digraphs.

Key Words: Nonstandard digraphs, ultrapower constructions of digraphs, transfer of digraph properties.

1 Introduction

Transfinite and nonstandard¹ graphs have been constructed and examined in prior works. More recent works on these subjects are [5], [6], and [7]. However, transfinite and nonstandard generalizations of digraphs had not yet been achieved. We now aim to do so. In this present report, we discuss nonstandard digraphs. In two subsequent reports, we will investigate transfinite digraphs and digraphs that are both transfinite and nonstandard. Since digraphs have more structure than do graphs, our present discussions, though similar to those for graphs, require more complicated definitions and yield more detailed and broader results.

¹It is preferable here to use the adjective "nonstandard" instead of the prefix "hyper", commonly used in nonstandard analysis, because the word "hypergraph" designates an entirely different kind of graph [1]. Also, we will be using "standard" as a special case of "nonstandard".

Our notations and symbols are the same as those specified in [6, Section 1.1]. Let us mention here some of them. Braces $\{\dots\}$ denote a set; its elements within the braces are all distinct, and the order in which they are listed is not significant. On the other hand, angle brackets $\langle\dots\rangle$ denote a sequence; its elements within the angle brackets have an imposed order from left to right; also, those elements may repeat. As a special case, we have an ordered pair, that is, a two-element sequence $\langle a, b \rangle$ with a preceding b . $\mathbf{N}$ denotes the set of natural numbers: $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. $\mathcal{F}$ denotes a nonprincipal ultrafilter on $\mathbf{N}$, which will remain fixed throughout this work.

2 Standard digraphs

Before presenting the definitions for nonstandard digraphs, let us state explicitly what we mean by a "standard digraph." We will use a rather different, but virtually equivalent, definition of a standard digraph as compared to the conventional definition.² The reason for this is that we wish to construct standard digraphs in the same way as will be done for transfinite digraphs.

We start with a set A of arcs, where each arc $a \in A$ is an ordered pair $a = \langle s, t \rangle$ of *ditips*. We refer to s as the *intip* of a and to t as the *outtip* of a , and we view a as having a direction from s to t . Then, the union of all the arcs is a set T of ditips with each intip having a corresponding outtip in T in accordance with the arcs. We will also let T_i (resp. T_o) denote the set of intips (resp. outtips), and thus $T = T_i \cup T_o$.

We now partition T arbitrarily. Each set v in that partition is a *vertex*. V will denote the set of vertices. Accordingly, we say that each arc $a = \langle s, t \rangle$ is *directed* from the vertex u containing its intip s toward the vertex v containing its outtip t . Possibly, u and v are the same vertex, resulting in the arc being a *self-loop*. We say that u and a are *incident inward* and that v and a are *incident outward*.³

²See, for instance, [4, Section 22].

³In order to relate our unusual version of a digraph to the conventional one, we can at this point identify an arc a as the ordered pair $a = \langle u, v \rangle$. However, our present construction allows self-loops and parallel arcs—in contrast to the conventional case.

Finally, a (standard) *digraph* D is the pair

$$D = \{A, V\}. \quad (1)$$

The "underlying graph" G of D is obtained by removing the directions of the arcs. Thus, each intip and each outtip becomes merely a *tip* with no implication of a direction. An arc $a = \langle s, t \rangle$ becomes a *branch* $b = \{s, t\}$ with $s, t \in T$, where T is the set of tips. The set A of arcs becomes a set B of branches. Moreover, the partition of the set T of tips now becomes a set X of *nodes*. Finally, the *underlying graph* G of $D = \{A, V\}$ is

$$G = \{B, X\} \quad (2)$$

This structure is discussed in more detail in [6, Section 2.2].

In subsequent parts of this three-part work, we will be dealing with transfinite digraphs. These appear in a hierarchy of transfiniteness ranked by the natural numbers and subsequently by the countable ordinals. In that case, the standard digraphs and its vertices will be assigned the rank 0, and the notation (1) will be replaced by

$$D^0 = \{A, V^0\}.$$

Also, the intips and outtips will be called (-1) -intips and (-1) -outtips, respectively. Furthermore, T^{-1} will denote the set of the ditips of all the arcs, with the notations s and t replaced by s^{-1} and t^{-1} , respectively.

3 Nonstandard digraphs

Let $\langle D_n : n \in \mathbf{N} \rangle$ be some chosen and fixed sequence of standard digraphs. Here, $D_n = \{A_n, V_n\}$ with A_n and V_n being respectively the set of arcs and the set of vertices for D_n . These digraphs may overlap; that is, for $n \neq m$ we may have $A_n \cap A_m \neq \emptyset$.⁴ In addition, $\mathcal{F}$ will denote a nonprincipal ultrafilter. It will be understood henceforth that $\mathcal{F}$ is chosen and fixed.

Next, let $\langle a_n \rangle = \langle a_n : n \in \mathbf{N} \rangle$ be a sequence of arcs with $a_n \in A_n$ for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$. A *nonstandard arc* $\mathbf{a}$ is an equivalence class of all such sequences of arcs. By "equivalence" we

⁴In fact, we can view the D_n as being subgraphs of a large digraph $D = \{A, V\}$, where A contains $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n$. But, this idea will not be pursued.

mean that every two such sequences $\langle a_n \rangle$ and $\langle \acute{a}_n \rangle$ are taken to be *equivalent* if $\{n : a_n = \acute{a}_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$. In this case, we write " $\langle a_n \rangle = \langle \acute{a}_n \rangle$ a.e." or say that $a_n = \acute{a}_n$ for almost all n . We also use the notation $\mathbf{a} = [a_n]$ where the a_n are the members of one i.e., any one) of the sequences in the equivalence class.

That this truly partitions the set of all such sequences is seen as follows. Reflexivity and symmetry are obvious. As for transitivity, let $\langle a_n \rangle$, $\langle \acute{a}_n \rangle$, and $\langle \tilde{a}_n \rangle$ be three such sequences with $\langle a_n \rangle$ and $\langle \acute{a}_n \rangle$ being equivalent and $\langle \acute{a}_n \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{a}_n \rangle$ being equivalent. Then, $N_{a\acute{a}} = \{n : a_n = \acute{a}_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$, $N_{\acute{a}\tilde{a}} = \{n : \acute{a}_n = \tilde{a}_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$, and $N_{a\tilde{a}} = \{n : a_n = \tilde{a}_n\} \supseteq N_{a\acute{a}} \cap N_{\acute{a}\tilde{a}} \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence, $N_{a\tilde{a}} \in \mathcal{F}$, which asserts that $\langle a_n \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{a}_n \rangle$ are equivalent.

Whenever $\langle a_n \rangle$ and $\langle \acute{a}_n \rangle$ are equivalent, their corresponding sequences $\langle s_n \rangle$ and $\langle \acute{s}_n \rangle$ of intips are perforce equivalent, too, because each intip uniquely determines its arc, and conversely. Thus, $\{n : s_n = \acute{s}_n\} = \{n : a_n = \acute{a}_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$. For the same reason, the corresponding sequences of outtips, namely, $\langle t_n \rangle$ and $\langle \acute{t}_n \rangle$ are equivalent, too.

So far, we have, from the above partition of the set of sequences $\langle a_n \rangle$ of arcs, a set *A of nonstandard arcs $\mathbf{a} = [a_n]$. Correspondingly, we get a partition of the set of sequences $\langle s_n \rangle$ of intips (resp. a partition of the set of sequences $\langle t_n \rangle$ of outtips), and the sets of that partition are the *nonstandard intips* (resp. *nonstandard outtips*). We let $\mathbf{s} = [s_n]$ (resp. $\mathbf{t} = [t_n]$) be a typical nonstandard intip (resp. nonstandard outtip), and we then have the nonstandard arc $\mathbf{a} = \langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \rangle$. We let T_i (resp. T_o) denote the set of all nonstandard intips (resp. the set of all nonstandard outtips). We now wish to construct the set *V of all "nonstandard vertices."

For each $n \in \mathbf{N}$, let p_n be a tip of an arc in A_n ; that is, p_n is either an intip or an outtip of that arc. Then, consider the sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$. Let N_i be the set of all n for which p_n is an intip, and let N_o be the set of all n for which p_n is an outtip. Thus, $N_i \cap N_o = \emptyset$ and $N_i \cup N_o = \mathbf{N}$. So, either N_i or N_o (but not both) is a member of $\mathcal{F}$. If it is N_i (resp. N_o), we can show that $\langle p_n \rangle$ is the representative of a nonstandard intip (resp. a nonstandard outtip) as follows.

Let $\langle p_n \rangle$ and $\langle q_n \rangle$ be two equivalent sequences of ditips. Remember that these are taken to be equivalent if $p_n = q_n$ for almost all n . This equivalence partitions the set of all

sequences of ditips into equivalence classes. Indeed, reflexivity and symmetry are obvious, and transitivity follows as usual. Each such equivalence class is taken to be a *nonstandard ditip* $\mathbf{p} = [p_n]$. Moreover, if $[p_n]$ is a nonstandard intip, then so, too, must be $[q_n]$. Indeed, we have $N_{pq} = \{n : p_n = q_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Moreover, the set N_p of all n for which p_n is an intip is also a member of $\mathcal{F}$. Let N_q be the set of all n for which q_n is an intip. Now, $N_q \supseteq N_p \cap N_{pq} \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence, $N_q \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus, $[q_n]$ is a nonstandard intip. In the same way, it follows that, if $[p_n]$ is a nonstandard outtip, then so, too, is $[q_n]$.

More notation: Let p_n and q_n be two ditips of D_n , not necessarily of the same kind. That is, one may be an intip and the other an outtip or they may be both intips or both outtips. If p_n and q_n are members of the same vertex in V_n (resp. in different vertices of V_n), we say that p_n and q_n are *shorted together* (resp. *not shorted together*), and we write $p_n \asymp q_n$ (resp. $p_n \not\asymp q_n$).

Next, let $\mathbf{p} = [p_n]$ and $\mathbf{q} = [q_n]$ be two nonstandard ditips. Let $N_{pq} = \{n : p_n \asymp q_n\}$ and $N_{pq}^c = \{n : p_n \not\asymp q_n\}$. Either $N_{pq} \in \mathcal{F}$ or $N_{pq}^c \in \mathcal{F}$, but not both. If $N_{pq} \in \mathcal{F}$ (resp. $N_{pq}^c \in \mathcal{F}$), we say that $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ are *shorted together* and we write $\mathbf{p} \asymp \mathbf{q}$ (resp. $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ are *not shorted together* and we write $\mathbf{p} \not\asymp \mathbf{q}$). Furthermore, we take it that $\mathbf{p}$ is shorted to itself: $\mathbf{p} \asymp \mathbf{p}$. This shorting is an equivalence relation for the set of all nonstandard ditips. Indeed, with reflexivity and symmetry again being obvious, consider transitivity. Assume $\mathbf{p} \asymp \mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{q} \asymp \mathbf{r}$. Since $\{n : p_n \asymp q_n\} \cap \{n : q_n \asymp r_n\} \subseteq \{n : p_n \asymp r_n\}$, it follows that $\mathbf{p} \asymp \mathbf{r}$. The resulting equivalence classes are the *nonstandard vertices*.

This definition is independent if the representative sequences chosen for the nonstandard ditips. Indeed, let $\mathbf{p} = [p_n] = [\tilde{p}_n]$ and $\mathbf{q} = [q_n] = [\tilde{q}_n]$. Set $N_p = \{n : p_n = \tilde{p}_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $N_q = \{n : q_n = \tilde{q}_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Assume $[p_n] \asymp [q_n]$. Thus, $N_{pq} = \{n : p_n \asymp q_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$. We want to show that $N_{\tilde{p}\tilde{q}}$ is a member of $\mathcal{F}$, so that $[\tilde{p}_n] \asymp [\tilde{q}_n]$. We have $(N_p \cap N_q \cap N_{pq}) \subseteq N_{\tilde{p}\tilde{q}}$. Hence, $N_{\tilde{p}\tilde{q}} = \{n : \tilde{p}_n \asymp \tilde{q}_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$, whence our conclusion.

Altogether, we have defined a nonstandard vertex $\mathbf{v}$ to some set in the partition of the set of nonstandard ditips induced by the shorting $\asymp$. ${}^*\mathbf{V}$ will denote the set of nonstandard vertices.

Thus, we now have the *nonstandard digraph*⁵

$${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\} \quad (3)$$

obtained from the given sequence $\langle D_n \rangle$ of standard digraphs.

Let us note that we obtained *D by starting from a given sequence $\langle D_n : n \in \mathbf{N} \rangle$, where $D_n = \{A_n, V_n\}$. But, any other sequence $\langle \tilde{D}_n : n \in \mathbf{N} \rangle$, where $\tilde{D}_n = \{\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{V}_n\}$ could be used to get the same *D so long as $\{n : A_n = \tilde{A}_n\}$ and $\{n : V_n = \tilde{V}_n\}$ are both members of $\mathcal{F}$. In this regard, see [2, Theorem 12.1.1].

Finally, the *underlying nonstandard graph* *G of *D is obtained simply by removing the directions of the arcs in each D_n to get branches in a standard graph G_n . When doing this, oppositely directed arcs incident to the same two vertices become parallel branches, but we allow parallel branches. Then, the equivalence partitioning of the set of sequences of arcs becomes an equivalence partitioning of the set of sequences of branches to yield the nonstandard branches, the set of which is denoted by *B . In the same way, the ditips of an arc in D_n become the tips of a branch in G_n . Then, the corresponding equivalence partitioning of the set of all sequences of ditips that yielded the nonstandard ditips becomes an equivalence partitioning of the set of all sequences of tips, and the sets of that partitioning become the nonstandard tips. Next, the shortings of the nonstandard ditips to get the nonstandard vertices is mimicked by shortings of nonstandard tips to get the nonstandard nodes, the set of which is denoted by *X . Finally, the underlying graph of ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$ is

$${}^*G = \{{}^*B, {}^*X\}.$$

4 Special cases

One special case arises when all the D_n are the same standard graph $D = \{A, V\}$. In this case, ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$ will be called an *enlargement* of D .

If D is a finite digraph, each arc $\mathbf{a} \in {}^*A$ can be identified with an arc $a \in A$ because the enlargement of a finite set is the set itself. In this case, every nonstandard vertex $\mathbf{v} \in {}^*V$ can be identified with a vertex $v \in V$. Thus, ${}^*D = D$.

⁵To conform with common terminology in nonstandard analysis, we could have called this a "hypergraph" but will not do so because that term is used for an entirely different kind of graph [1].

On the other hand, if $D = \{A, V\}$ is a conventionally infinite digraph, that is, if A is an infinite set, then the enlargement *A of A has more elements than A , namely, nonstandard arcs that are different from the standard arcs (i.e., $^*A \setminus A$ is not empty). However, V may or may not be an infinite set. If V is infinite, $^*V \setminus V$ is not empty, too. But, if V is finite, then each vertex in *V can be identified with a vertex in V . In either case, *D is a proper enlargement of D since *A is a proper enlargement of A . This special case is examined again in Section 10.

Another special case arises when almost all of the $D_n = \{A_n, V_n\}$ are (possibly different) finite digraphs. We now call the nonstandard digraph $^*D = \{^*A, ^*V\}$ a *hyperfinite digraph*. As a result, we can lift many theorems concerning finite digraphs into theorems about hyperfinite digraphs. This can be done by writing the theorems about finite digraphs in symbolic-logic notation and then applying the transfer principal.

5 Incidences

Given an arc $a = \langle s, t \rangle$ and a vertex u containing the intip s of a , we say that a and u are *incident inward* and write $a \hookleftarrow u$ or $u \hookrightarrow a$. Similarly, if a vertex v contains the outtip t of a , we say that a and v are *incident outward* and write $a \hookrightarrow v$ or $v \hookleftarrow a$.⁶ For the symbolic sentences used below, we let T_i (resp. T_o) be the set of intips (resp. outtips). Then, $u \hookrightarrow a$ will mean that $(\exists s \in T_i)(\exists u \in V)(\exists a \in A)(s \in u \wedge s \in a)$. Also, $a \hookrightarrow v$ will mean $(\exists t \in T_o)(\exists v \in V)(\exists a \in A)(t \in a \wedge t \in v)$. Thus, "inward" and "outward" express directions with respect to a (not with respect to v). So, if the vertex u contains the intip of a and the vertex v contains the outtip of a , we may write $u \hookrightarrow a \hookrightarrow v$ or $v \hookleftarrow a \hookleftarrow u$. It is possible that u and v are the same vertex, in which case a is a *self-loop*.

We can express these incidences in symbolic notation as follows. In the standard case, we have

$$(\exists a \in A)(\exists u \in V)(\exists v \in V)(u \hookrightarrow a \hookrightarrow v) \quad (4)$$

Upon applying the transfer principle, we obtain the symbolic sentence in terms of nonstan-

⁶Our symbols $\hookrightarrow$ and $\hookleftarrow$ are not the implication symbols $\rightarrow$ and $\leftarrow$ used in symbolic languages.

dard quantities:

$$(\exists \mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A})(\exists \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{V})(\exists \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V})(\mathbf{u} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{a} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{v}) \quad (5)$$

The words "incident inward" and "incident outward" then apply for $\mathbf{u} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{a} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{v}$, respectively.

Alternatively, in terms of an ultrapower construction, we can take it that, for almost all n , we have $a_n \in A_n$, $u_n \in V_n$, $v_n \in V_n$, and then can require that $\{n : u_n \hookrightarrow a_n \hookrightarrow v_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$ in order to obtain (5) again.

6 Adjacencies

For a standard digraph $D = \{A, V\}$, two standard vertices $u, v \in V$ are called *adjacent* when the following is true:

$$(\exists u, v \in V)(\exists a = \langle s, t \rangle \in A)((s \in u \wedge t \in v) \vee (s \in v \wedge t \in u)).$$

By transfer, we have *adjacency* for two nonstandard vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in {}^*V$ for ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$ when the following is true:

$$(\exists \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in {}^*V)(\exists \mathbf{a} = \langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \rangle \in {}^*A)((\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{v}) \vee (\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{u}))$$

Similarly, two standard arcs $a, c \in A$ are called adjacent if the following is true:

$$(\exists w \in V)(\exists a = \langle s_a, t_a \rangle \in A)(\exists c = \langle s_c, t_c \rangle \in A)((s_a, s_b \in w) \vee (s_a, t_b \in w) \vee (t_a, s_b \in w) \vee (t_a, t_b \in w))$$

Again by transfer, we get the definition for *adjacency* for two nonstandard arcs $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \in {}^*A$ by using boldface notation for the vertices, arcs, and tips and replacing V and A by *V and *A , respectively.

7 Dipaths and semipaths

A *standard finite dipath* P in $D = \{A, V\}$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\exists k \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{0\})(\exists a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} \in A)(\exists v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k \in V) \\ &(v_0 \hookrightarrow a_0 \hookrightarrow v_1 \hookrightarrow a_1 \hookrightarrow v_2 \hookrightarrow \dots \hookrightarrow v_{k-1} \hookrightarrow a_{k-1} \hookrightarrow v_k) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It is understood that all the arcs and vertices herein are distinct. The length $|P|$ of P is the number of arcs herein; i.e., $|P| = k$.

By transfer, we get the following definition of a *nonstandard hyperfinite dipath* *P in ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$:

$$(\exists \mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{0\})(\exists \mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{k}-1} \in {}^*A)(\exists \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} \in {}^*V) \\ (\mathbf{v}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{a}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{v}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{a}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{v}_2 \dots \hookrightarrow \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}-1} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{k}-1} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}) \quad (7)$$

Because ${}^*D = [D_n]$, where the D_n may be finite digraphs that grow unlimitedly in size as n increases through $\mathbf{N}$ or indeed may be infinite digraphs, $\mathbf{k}$ may be a hypernatural number in ${}^*\mathbf{N} \setminus \mathbf{N}$. The length $|{}^*P|$ of *P is $\mathbf{k}$.

The definition of a *nonstandard hyperfinite diloop* *L is obtained by transfer from the definition of a standard finite diloop L ; that is, for L we may use the definition (6) with the proviso that $v_k = v_0$. Thus, by setting $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{v}_0$ in (7), we obtain the definition of *L .

A *finite semipath* P_s in D is defined as is a dipath except that the directions of the arcs are ignored. In particular, the symbols $v \vdash a$ and $a \dashv$ will both mean that a tip in the vertex v is a member of the arc a . That tip could be either an intip or an outtip of a . Similarly, the symbol $u \vdash a \dashv v$ means that a tip of a is a member of u and the other tip of a is a member of v . On the other hand, $a \dashv v \vdash b$ denotes that a tip of v is a member of a and that another tip of v is member of the arc b .

Then, P_s is defined by

$$(\exists k \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{0\})(\exists a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} \in A)(\exists v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k \in V) \\ (v_0 \vdash a_0 \dashv v_1 \vdash a_1 \dashv v_2 \vdash \dots \dashv v_{k-1} \vdash a_{k-1} \dashv v_k) \quad (8)$$

Here, too, it is understood that all the arcs and vertices are distinct. Actually, P_s can be identified as a path in the underlying graph G of D . The length $|P_s|$ of P_s is k .

By transfer, we get the definition of a *nonstandard hyperfinite semipath* *P_s in ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$. It can be obtained from (8) by writing boldface notation for k , a , and v and replacing $\mathbf{N}$, A , and V by ${}^*\mathbf{N}$, *A , and *V . We have $\mathbf{k} \in {}^*\mathbf{N}$ and possibly $\mathbf{k} \in {}^*\mathbf{N} \setminus \mathbf{N}$. The length of *P_s is $|{}^*P_s| = \mathbf{k}$.

The definition of a *standard finite diloop* is obtained from (8) by setting $v_k = v_0$. For a *nonstandard hyperfinite diloop*, make the same replacements as before.

8 Connectedness and components

The ideas of strong connectedness, unilateral connectedness, and weak connectedness for standard digraphs are well-known [3] and need not be explicated here. These ideas transfer directly to the definition for connectedness between two vertices $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ in the nonstandard digraph $*D = \{*A, *V\}$:

$\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are called *strongly connected* if there exists a hyperfinite dipath from $\mathbf{u}$ to $\mathbf{v}$ and also a hyperfinite dipath from $\mathbf{v}$ to $\mathbf{u}$.

$\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are called *unilaterally connected* if there exists a hyperfinite dipath from one of those vertices to the other.

$\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are called *weakly connected* if there exists a hyperfinite semipath terminating at $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$.

Thus, strong connectedness implies unilateral connectedness, which in turn implies weak connectedness.

Also, $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are called *disconnected* if there is no path of any kind between them.

A nonstandard digraph $*D = \{*A, *V\}$ is said to be *strong* (resp. *unilateral*, resp. *weak*) if every two vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in *V$ are strongly connected (resp. unilaterally connected, resp. weakly connected). Also, $*D$ is called *strictly unilateral* (resp. *strictly weak*) if $*D$ is unilateral but not strong (resp. $*D$ is weak but not unilateral). Moreover, $*D$ is called *disconnected* if it has two vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ that are disconnected.

We turn now to the ideas of "subdigraphs" and "reduced digraphs". Given the standard digraph $D = \{A, V\}$, let A_s be a subset of A , that is, A_s consists of some but not necessarily all of the arcs in A . Furthermore, let V_s be the subset of V consisting of those vertices in V having at least one tip (i.e., an intip or an outtip) belonging to an arc in A_s . Then, the *subdigraph D_s of D induced by A_s* is the doublet

$$D_s = \{A_s, V_s\} \tag{9}$$

We can also define a subdigraph $D_{ss} = \{A_{ss}, V_{ss}\}$ of D_s by choosing a subset A_{ss} of A_s and defining V_{ss} from A_{ss} as V_s was defined from A_s .

Note that D_s need not be a digraph by itself because V_s may contain a vertex having a tip belonging to an arc not in A_s . To overcome this anomaly, we can *reduce* such vertices as follows. Reduce each such vertex v in V_s by removing those tips in v that are not members of arcs in A_s . The remaining set of tips is the *reduced vertex* v_r ; v_r is not empty. The set of reduced vertices will be denoted by V_r , and the pair $\{A_s, V_r\}$ can be called the *reduced digraph* D_r of D induced by the chosen subset A_s of A . In the following, we will be dealing with the subdigraph (9) rather than the reduced digraph D_r .

The definition of a "nonstandard arc-induced subdigraph" ${}^*D_s = \{{}^*A_s, {}^*V_s\}$ of ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$ can be obtained by transfer of the above standard definition. Just to vary our discussion, let us present the nonstandard definition by means of an ultrapower construction of *D . We start with a sequence $\langle D_n \rangle = \langle A_n, V_n \rangle$ of standard digraphs, where $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and also with a sequence $\langle D_{s,n} \rangle = \langle \{A_{s,n}, V_{s,n}\} \rangle$, where each $D_{s,n}$ is an arc-induced subdigraph of D_n . Let $[a_n]$ denote a nonstandard arc in *A ; thus, $[a_n]$ is in *A_s if $\{n : a_n \in A_{s,n}\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, let $V_{s,n}$ be the set of vertices in V_n such that each vertex contains at least one tip of an arc in $A_{s,n}$. Then, $[v_n] \in {}^*V_s$ if $\{n : v_n \in V_{s,n}\} \in \mathcal{F}$. The intersection of these two sets defining *A_s and *V_s is also in $\mathcal{F}$. As a result, we obtain the subdigraph ${}^*D_s = \{{}^*A_s, {}^*V_s\}$, which we call a *nonstandard arc-induced subdigraph of *D* (induced by the arcs in *A_s). More concisely, we refer to *D_s as a *subdigraph of *D* .

We turn now to the concept of "components" in ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$. A *strong component* of *D is a maximal set of nonstandard vertices that are pairwise strongly connected.

By substituting "unilateral" or "weak" for "strong" in the preceding paragraph, we get the definitions of *unilateral component* or *weak component* in *D , respectively. It follows that, in *D , a strong component is a subset of a unilateral component, and the latter is a subset of a weak component.

9 Bounds on the number of arcs in a nonstandard hyperfinite digraph

As was mentioned in Section 4, results concerning finite digraphs can be extended directly to nonstandard hyperfinite digraphs by means of transfer. As an example of this, let us transfer certain bounds on the number q of arcs of a standard digraph having p vertices.

Let *D_f be a nonstandard hyperfinite digraph with no parallel arcs and no self-loops (i.e., for almost all of the finite D_n from which *D_f is obtained, there are no parallel arcs and no self-loops). Also, let *D_f have $\mathbf{q}$ arcs and $\mathbf{p}$ vertices. Here $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{p}$ are hypernatural numbers. We can obtain bounds on $\mathbf{q}$ in terms of $\mathbf{p}$ for various categories of connectedness by transferring results on standard digraphs, as stated for instance in [3, pages 71-75]. Specifically, we have the following:

If *D_f is complete and symmetric (i.e., if $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ and $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$ are arcs in *A for every pair of vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in {}^*V$), then $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{p} - 1)$.

If *D_f is disconnected, then $0 \leq \mathbf{q} \leq (\mathbf{p} - 1)(\mathbf{p} - 2)$.

If *D_f is strictly weak, then $\mathbf{p} - 1 \leq \mathbf{q} \leq (\mathbf{p} - 1)(\mathbf{p} - 2)$ and $\mathbf{p} \geq 3$.

If *D_f is strictly unilateral, then $\mathbf{p} - 1 \leq \mathbf{q} \leq (\mathbf{p} - 1)^2$.

If *D_f is strong and if $\mathbf{p} > 1$, then $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{p} - 1)$.

10 The galaxies of nonstandard enlargements of infinite digraphs

The discussion in this section is much like that for enlargements of graphs [7], but there is more to say regarding enlargements of digraphs.

We now start with a standard digraph $D = \{A, V\}$ having an infinity of arcs and an infinity of vertices. As always, we assume that D is weakly connected. Now, ${}^*D = \{{}^*A, {}^*V\}$ denotes the nonstandard enlargement of D . Consequently, ${}^*A \setminus A$ and ${}^*V \setminus V$ are both nonempty and contain nonstandard arcs and nonstandard vertices, respectively.

We define the "galaxies" of *D in the same way as was done for the enlargement of an infinite graph [7, Section 3]. Let us be specific here. The length $|P_{uv}|$ of any semipath P_{uv} connecting two vertices u and v in D is the number of arcs in P_{uv} . The distance $d(u, v)$

between u and v is $d(u, v) = \min\{|P_{uv}|\}$, where the minimum is taken over all the semipaths terminating at u and v . Also, for any vertex u , we set $d(u, u) = 0$. d is a metric for V , with reflexivity and symmetry being obvious and the triangle inequality being readily shown. So, we can view V as being a metric space with d as its metric. Now, d can be extended into an internal function $\mathbf{d}$ mapping the Cartesian product ${}^*V \times {}^*V$ into the set of hypernaturals ${}^*\mathbf{N}$, where, for any $\mathbf{u} = [u_n]$ and $\mathbf{v} = [v_n]$, $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = [d(u_n, v_n)] \in {}^*\mathbf{N}.$$

By the transfer principle, we have, for any three nonstandard vertices $\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{v}$, and $\mathbf{w}$,

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}).$$

We define the "galaxies" of *D by first defining the "vertex galaxies". Two nonstandard vertices $\mathbf{u} = [u_n]$ and $\mathbf{v} = [v_n]$ are defined to be in the same *vertex galaxy* $\dot{\Gamma}$ of *D if $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is no greater than a standard hypernatural $\mathbf{k}$, that is, if there exists a natural number $k \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\{n : d(u_n, v_n) \leq k\} \in \mathcal{F}$. In this case, we say that $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are *limitedly distant*, and we write $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq \mathbf{k}$.

By the same proof as that of [7, Lemma 3.1], we have

*Lemma 10.1. The vertex galaxies partition the set of all nonstandard vertices in *D .*

We define a galaxy Γ of *D as a vertex galaxy $\dot{\Gamma}$ along with the set $A(\dot{\Gamma})$ of all the nonstandard arcs that are each incident to two nonstandard vertices in $\dot{\Gamma}$. That is, for each $\dot{\Gamma}$, we have $\Gamma = \{A(\dot{\Gamma}), \dot{\Gamma}\}$. It follows from Lemma 10.1 that the galaxies of *D partition *D in the sense that each nonstandard arc is in one and only one galaxy, namely, the galaxy Γ corresponding to the nonstandard vertex galaxy $\dot{\Gamma}$. We will say that all the nonstandard vertices in $\dot{\Gamma}$ and all the nonstandard arcs in $A(\dot{\Gamma})$ are in Γ .

The *principal galaxy* Γ_0 of *D is that unique galaxy, each of whose nonstandard vertices is limitedly distant from some standard vertex. All the vertices in V , where V is the vertex set in the standard digraph D , are (i.e., can be identified with) standard vertices in Γ_0 , but there may be other nonstandard vertices in Γ_0 as well.

Let us note that a galaxy need not be a subdigraph of *D according to the definition of the latter adopted in Section 8 and also in contrast to the terminology used in [7]. This

is because a nonstandard vertex in $\dot{\Gamma}$ may have more nonstandard tips in it than those belonging only to the nonstandard arcs in $A(\dot{\Gamma})$.

Five examples of galaxies in nonstandard digraphs can be obtained from Examples 3.2 to 3.6 in [7] simply by viewing the branches therein as arcs. This is because the galaxies in *D are defined by means of distances based upon semipaths in the digraph D , or equivalently by distances in the underlying graph G of D .

For the same reason, the theorems in [7, Sections 3 and 4] can be restated for digraphs with merely a change in wording. Let us list those appropriately reworded theorems here. Their proofs remain the same as those in [7]. Remember that in this section D has an infinity of arcs, an infinity of vertices, and is weakly connected.

*Theorem 10.2. Let $D = \{A, V\}$ be locally finite (i.e., each vertex in V contains only finitely many tips). Then, *D has at least one nonstandard vertex not in its principal galaxy Γ_0 , and thus at least one galaxy different from Γ_0 .*

Let Γ_a and Γ_b be two galaxies of *D that are different from the principal galaxy Γ_0 of *D . We shall say that Γ_a is closer to Γ_0 than is Γ_b and that Γ_b is further away from Γ_0 than is Γ_a if there are a $\mathbf{v} = [v_n]$ in Γ_a and a $\mathbf{w} = [w_n]$ in Γ_b such that, for some $\mathbf{u} = [u_n]$ in Γ_0 and for every $m \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$N_0(m) = \{n : d(w_n, u_n) - d(v_n, u_n) \geq m\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Any set of galaxies for which every two of them, say Γ_a and Γ_b satisfy this condition will be said to be *totally ordered according to their closeness to Γ_0* . The axioms for a total ordering using weak connectedness are easily shown. Also, these definitions do not depend upon the sequences $\langle u_n \rangle$, $\langle v_n \rangle$, and $\langle w_n \rangle$ chosen for $\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{w}$.

*Theorem 10.3. If *D has a nonstandard vertex $\mathbf{v}$ that is not in its principal galaxy Γ_0 , then there exists a two-way infinite sequence of galaxies that is totally ordered according to those galaxies closeness to Γ_0 with $\mathbf{v}$ being in one of those galaxies.*

The axioms of a partial ordering of a set of galaxies are same as those for a total ordering except that the axiom of completeness is dropped.

*Theorem 10.4. Under the hypothesis of Theorem 10.3, the set of all the galaxies of *D is partially ordered according to the closeness of the galaxies to the principal galaxy Γ_0 .*

A subdigraph D_s of D with the property that there is a natural number k such that $d(u, v) \leq k$ for all pairs of vertices u, v in D_s will be called a *finitely dispersed* subdigraph of D . The structures of the galaxies other than the principal galaxy Γ_0 are independent of any finitely dispersed subdigraph of D because the vertices u_n in any representative $\langle u_n \rangle$ of any nonstandard vertex $\mathbf{u}$ in a galaxy other than Γ_0 must lie outside any finitely dispersed subdigraph of D for almost all n . (This is the same property as that for galaxies in nonstandard graphs [7, Section 3 and Example 3.6].)

References

- [1] C. Berge, *Graphs and Hypergraphs*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1973.
- [2] R. Goldblatt, *Lectures on the Hyperreals*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [3] F. Harary, R.Z. Norman, and D. Cartwright, *Structural Models*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1965.
- [4] R.J. Wilson, *Introduction to Graph Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [5] A.H. Zemanian, *Pristine Transfinite Graphs and Permissive Electrical Networks*, Birkhauser, Boston, 2001.
- [6] A.H. Zemanian, *Graphs and Networks: Transfinite and Nonstandard*, Birkhauser, Boston, 2001.
- [7] A.H. Zemanian, The galaxies of nonstandard enlargements of infinite and transfinite graphs, *Discrete Mathematics*, Vol. 309, Issue 6 (6 April 2009), 1391-1408.